

Appl. No. 10/802,177
Amdt. dated April 27, 2006
Reply to Office action of February 10, 2006

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached drawing sheet includes new Figure 8. Figure 8 has been added to show a conventional rudder of a watercraft as claimed in the present invention.

Attachment: New Sheet

REMARKS

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office action. Favorable reconsideration of the application is hereby requested in view of the comments and amendments made herein.

Applicant acknowledges with appreciation the allowance of claims 8, 9, 13, and 14.

The drawings were objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) for not showing every feature of the invention as specified in the claims. New Figure 8 is provided herein in accordance with the Examiner's suggestions. Specifically, new Figure 8 illustrates a watercraft having an inboard rudder. No new matter has been added by new Figure 8. Withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

The Specification was objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the following claimed subject matter: the rudder being an inboard rudder, as set forth in claim 1; the rudder being a non-motorized rudder, as set forth in claim 8; and the rudder being movable via a translational movement of the steering linkage bar, as set forth in claim 8. Accordingly, the specification has been amended herein to provide proper antecedent basis for the aforementioned limitations. Because the specification has only been amended to include the art recognized definition of a rudder, as known at the time of filing the application, the amendments made herein do not constitute new matter. Further, although Applicant disagrees, the Examiner maintains that there are multiple definitions of the term 'rudder'. However it is clear from the specification, as filed, that the claimed rudder was intended to be an inboard rudder, as recognized by those skilled in the art. This is clear by the distinction between the terms 'rudder' and 'outdrive unit' in paragraph [015] of the specification, as originally filed. The Examiner also concedes in the present Office action that the definition as set forth in the amended specification is the definition that applicant intended when filing the application. Thus, in accordance with section 2163.07 of the MPEP, the amendments made herein cannot be considered new matter and should be entered. Withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Appl. No. 10/802,177
Amdt. dated April 27, 2006
Reply to Office action of February 10, 2006

Claims 1-7, 10-12, and 15-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. It is believed that the amendments made to the specification herein cure this rejection. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection and allowance of claims 1-7, 10-12, and 15-17 are respectfully requested.

In consideration of the foregoing analysis, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any further fees required by this communication, or if no check is enclosed, please charge such fees to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, Order No. 36185.

Respectfully submitted,
Pearne & Gordon LLP


Una L. Lauricia, Reg. No. 48998

1801 East 9th Street
Suite 1200
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108
216-579-1700

Date: April 27, 2006